

## **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of it is believed Claims 37-41, 43-52 and 69 (it appears that the "Office Action Summary" and the 4<sup>th</sup> line in "Allowable Subject Matter" are incorrect in the listing of allowed claims – it is respectfully requested that these be corrected in the next action).

### **Entry of Amendment and IDS**

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment and the accompanying IDS should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

### **Amendment To Claims**

In addition to the amendments discussed in detail below, Applicants are canceling Claims 4, 26, and 56 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants are also amending Claims 7, 27-28, and 58. In addition, Applicants are amending Claims 37 and 38 in order to correct minor errors therein

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

#### **Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70**

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada (US 6,114,715) in view of Friend et al.

(US 6,518,700) and further in view of Nagayama et al. (US 5,742,129). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 53 to include allowable subject matter, as stated in the Final Rejection.

More specifically, in the Final Rejection, in the section “Allowable Subject Matter”, the Examiner states that the prior art fails to disclose or fairly suggest (in the second bullet point):

“A partition wall that includes a light absorbing multilayer film comprising a laminate including a reflective metal film, a first light transmissive insulating film comprising nitride, a metal nitride film, and a second light transmissive insulating film comprising nitride, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 37 (claims 38-41, 43-52, and 69 are allowable for the same reasons since they are dependent on claim 37).”

Applicants are including these features in Claims 1 and 53. Hence, these claims are in an allowable condition.

In addition, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, appear to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Nagayama in view of Oda et al. (US 6,396,208). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend and further in view of Iwase et al. (US 6,768,534) in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above (i.e. reciting the features of the Allowable Subject Matter). Accordingly, Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Iwase in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda et al. (JP 2000-269473) and further in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above (i.e. reciting the features of the Allowable Subject Matter). Accordingly, Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 9

The Examiner also rejects Claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 23 in similar manner to Claims 1 and 53 (i.e. reciting the features of the Allowable Subject Matter).

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, independent Claim 23 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 30

The Examiner also rejects Claim 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

In addition, it is noted that the second page of the 1449 attached to the Final Rejection (the first listed reference on this page is an article by Kamins) is not signed or initialed by the Examiner.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner sign and initial this page of the 1449 when responding to this amendment.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee is due for this amendment, the IDS, and/or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568